

REMARKS

This is a response to a non-final Office Action mailed on June 1, 2007. Claims 1-23 are pending. As last examined, claims 1, 2, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sidman (US Patent No. 5,317,441). Claims 3, 4, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sidman (US Patent No. 5,317,441) in view of Nomura (US Patent No. 6,731,881). Claims 5-13 and 18-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to rejection of claims 1, 2, 22, and 23

Claim 1

Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,317,441 by Sidman. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention includes novel and nonobvious features not disclosed in the Sidman reference.

For example, Examiner states that Sidman teaches a transmitting and receiving device comprising “a compensation device (i.e., a delay and compensation circuit 64 and comparator 66, Fig. 4) which is connected to the transmitting device and to the receiving device and which at least reduces any crosstalk which is produced by the transmitting device in the receiving device (i.e., col. 4, lines 3-47).”

Sidman Fig. 4 shows a delay and compensation device 64 connected to a transmitter 63 and to one input of a comparator 66. Sidman Fig. 4 further shows a receiving device 65

connected to the transmitter 63 and to the comparator 66. Connections between the delay and compensation device 64, transmitter 63, and comparator 66 are the same in the local transceiver 61 and the remote transceiver 62.

However, Sidman does not disclose a connection between a compensation device (referred to in Sidman as a delay and compensation device) and a receiving device. Applicants claim a connection between a compensation device and a receiving device in claim 1. Applicants' specification supports the claimed connection in the first sentence of paragraph [0038] and in Applicants' Fig. 2. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art does not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed inventions.

Claim 1 has been amended to change punctuation. Applicants believe amended claim 1 includes novel and nonobvious limitations not found in the cited prior art reference and respectfully request withdrawal of Examiner's rejection.

Claim 2

In addition to novel and nonobvious limitations found in claim 2, this claim depends from claim 1 which has been shown to be novel. Therefore, by virtue of its dependency on claim 1, claim 2 should also be in allowable form. Allowance of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-23

Claim 22 has been amended to correct a grammatical error. Amended claim 22 and claim 23 distinguish over Sidman for the reasons already presented in the remarks for Claim 1. Claims 22 and 23 include novel and nonobvious limitations not found in the cited prior art references and therefore allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Response to rejection of claims 3, 4, and 14-17

Claims 3, 4, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sidman in view of Nomura (US Patent No. 6,731,881).

Claim 13 has been amended to change a word to an alternate spelling.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sidman does not disclose or suggest all aspects of Applicants' inventions, as discussed in the remarks for claim 1 and not repeated here. The Examiner's rejection, citing Sidman in view of Nomura, is moot in light of overcoming Sidman. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Allowable claims 5-13 and 18-21

Claims 5-13 and 18-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants appreciate Examiner's indication of the allowability of the above noted claims if amended, however, for the reasons pointed out previously the claims from which they depend are believed to be independently patentable and accordingly amendment as suggested by the Examiner is not required.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons above, Applicants submit that the claims all define novel subject matter that is nonobvious. Therefore, allowance of these claims is submitted to be proper and is respectfully requested.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative as listed below for a telephonic interview if doing so would expedite prosecution of the application.

Very respectfully submitted,



Phillip M. Wagner
GSS Law Group
3900 Newpark Mall Rd
Third Floor, Suite 317
Newark, CA 94560

Reg. No. 57,575
Phone (510) 742-7417
Fax (510) 742-7419